MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 2,1926.

The fourth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1927 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on December 2, 1926.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Greenleaf,
Mr. Mowbray,
Mr. Delano,
Mr. Garfield,
also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Commission welcomed the return of Mr. Greenleaf, who had been visiting in Europe since last May.

Mr. Medary was prevented from attending the meeting in the rooms of the Commission, owing to the fact that, as President of the American Institute of Architects, he was holding a meeting of the Board of Directors at the Octagon. However, Mr. Medary arranged to inspect plans for the American Chapels and Monuments in Europe on Wednesday, December 1st, and was in conference with General Pershing for 1½ hours on the subject.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the meeting held October 14, 15 and 16, 1926, were approved.

2. APPOINTMENT OF A SUCCESSOR TO MR. MOORE: The secretary reported that the term of service of Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman of the Commission, expired November 3, 1926.

Mr. Moore said he would be glad if another were appointed in his place, since he had been serving as a member of the Commission since its creation in 1910 and felt that now,"as everything was in good running order", it would be a good time to withdraw. However, Mr. Greenleaf, Mr. Mowbray, Mr. Delano and Mr. Garfield strongly urged the reappointment

of Mr. Moore to succeed himself, and upon motion of Mr. Greenleaf, which was duly seconded, the members decided they would recommend Mr. Moore's reappointment to the President, to succeed himself, especially at this time when so many projects are being undertaken for the development of the National Capital.

The secretary stated that it is very important that Mr. Moore remain on the Commission, since in all the great projects under way, which will make Washington one of the great Capital Cities of the world, the Plan of 1901 is being constantly referred to, in connection with which he is constantly consulted, as also on Public Building matters and the coming Bicentennial Celebration of the Birthday of George Washington.

Mr. Moore thereupon agreed to serve one more term, at the end of which, he said, he hoped there would be no more "critical period". The members signed a communication addressed to the President, asking for the reappointment of Mr. Moore (Exhibit A). ( The reappointment was made by President Coolidge on December 4th, and Mr. Moore took the oath of office for the new term December 9,1926).

3. PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROGRAM: Mr. Moore reported that about a week ago the Public Buildings Commission held a meeting which he attended and at which a plan, prepared by Mr. Edward H. Bennett, Architect, who has been appointed by Secretary Mellon special architectural adviser on the Public Buildings Program, was presented, showing a proposed layout of public buildings in the triangle south of Pennsylvania Avenue between the Capitol and the Treasury Department building at 15th Street. The plan provides for buildings as follows:

1. Department of Justice, 14th to 15th Street, Pa. Ave. to C Street,
2. Department of Commerce, 14th to 15th Street, C to B Street.
3. General Supply Building 13th to 14th, south of D Street.
4. Archives Building, Pa. Ave. to C Street, 12th to 13th Street.

5. Independent Offices Building, 12th to 13th, C to B Street.
6. Department of Labor, 13th to 14th, C to B Street,
7. Internal Revenue Building, 10th to 12th, C to B Street,
8. General Accounting Office, 9th to 10th, C to B Street.

Mr. Moore said that in general the plan was entirely satisfactory; that it fixes the site of the Department of Commerce Building, where originally intended, at 15th and B Streets, N.W., and thus takes it out of the Mall where the Public Buildings Commission tried to locate it; that the Archives Building is to have a frontage on Pennsylvania Avenue, between 12th and 13th Street, instead of on B Street, but this was not of vital importance and would simply mean an increased cost of construction over the B Street frontage, by requiring a monumental type of building along Pennsylvania Avenue. Mr. Moore said it is now proposed to recommend to Congress the purchase of this entire area at an estimated cost of $25,000,000, and that it is understood the President is not opposed to this plan. It was recalled that the Commission of Fine Arts had recommended this be done immediately after the Public Buildingsbill had been enacted.

The Commission expressed their satisfaction in the progress thus made in the development of the public buildings program and felt that questions arising in matters of detail could be adjusted as the building projects develop. Mr. Moore also stated that the site for the building for the Supreme Court of the United States had been agreed upon , namely the square north of the Library of Congress, at First and East Capitol Streets, which it is to balance, and where it will be one of the Capitol Group buildings.

4. PRIVATE BUILDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: The secretary submitted to the Commission the following statement for consideration with reference to private building in the District of Columbia, calling attention to the serious encroachments by private builders on parks and parkways and land;

designated for Government buildings:

December 2, 1926.

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Commission of Fine Arts.

During the past two weeks six instances have been brought to my particular attention as to proposed private buildings encroaching on sites contemplated for new public buildings and on park and parkway areas:

1. $5,000,000 apartment project, proposed to be built at the north end of the Connecticut Avenue Bridge, and adjacent to the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. The Zoning Commission denied the request to rezone the area.

2. Building of the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company, to be erected along Maine Avenue, and involving a rezoning of the area south of the Mall, between Third and Sixth Street, S.W., from 60 to 90 feet. A Spanish type of building with a 75 foot tower is contemplated.

3. The Lafayette Square apartment house, at 16th and H Streets, N.W. The Building Inspector's Office has advised that no plans for the building have been submitted, but it is understood that an apartment is contemplated for that location.

4. Ordinary stores to be built near the Western High School, Georgetown, to the detriment of the school and a good residential section.

5. It is reported that a site is being considered near the Lincoln Memorial for the apartment proposed for clerks of the Government.

6. Building being erected at B Street and Delaware Avenue, S.W.,-- a four-story apartment, adjacent to the Capitol. Senator Shipstead strongly protested against its construction (by telephone Saturday morning, November 27th) and was much surprised to hear that under the law plans for private buildings do not come under the jurisdiction of the Commission of Fine Arts. I told Senator Shipstead that I would bring this matter to your attention at this meeting of the Commission. I informed him that individuals have from time to time submitted plans for private buildings, and sent him a copy of the Tenth Report of the Commission, in which this subject is referred to on page 125.

Under the present law a private individual can submit plans to the Building Inspector's Office for a permit and receive it if he simply meets the requirements of the Zoning and Building regulations. The Zoning Commission hears about the plans only if the height of the building is to exceed the height permitted by the regulations. Thus aggravating circumstances as the above result, and they will become more numerous as the Public Buildings Program and the National Capital Park System develop.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Commission for special consideration and such recommendations as will safeguard the aesthetic development of the National Capital, and prevent further encroachment on public building sites and parkways and park areas.

H. P. Caemmerer,
Secretary.

The Commission were of the opinion that something should be done to control the situation in Washington, so as to protect the beauty of the National Capital. The Commission felt, however, that it was a matter in which Congress must acquiesce, and that Congress should be consulted in the matter. The secretary brought to the attention of the Commission a copy of the Philadelphia Ordinance, in which the Art Jury of that city is given a measure of control over private building, and this was taken under advisement by the Commission as to making it applicable to Washington.

5. BIRD HOUSE, ZOOLOGICAL PARK: Mr. A. L. Harris, Municipal Architect, submitted samples of brick for the new Bird House in the Zoological Park and asked the advice of the Commission concerning its use. The brick was of reddish brown color, made in Pennsylvania. The Commission thought the color suitable but expressed their preference for a brick with a smooth surface.

6. LANDSCAPE PLANS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Mr. Harris said he had 10 or more landscape plans for public schools in the District of Columbia, prepared in pursuance of a committee meeting which had been called by District Engineer Commissioner Bell, at the rooms of the Board of Edcuation on November 24, 1926, to consider the problem. Mr. Harris said the Committee had considered the problem favorably and had recommended that a landscape architect be employed to serve under the Municipal Architect and that it had been suggested that the planting be done under the supervision of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks.

Mr. Harris said it was very desirable and necessary that he have a landscape architect in his office on whom he could depend for such work not only with regard to school buildings, but hospital plans, police and fire

department stations, and other buildings erected from time to time by the District of Columbia. Mr. Harris said he desired the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to the landscape plans, which in the future are to be included in plans for school buildings.

The secretary stated that at the request of Mr. Moore he had attended the Committee meeting referred to by Mr. Harris, at which time he had called the attention of the Committee to the fact that at the present time there are 7 to 8 separate Government establishments in the District of Columbia attending to planting, which might be placed under the control of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks; also that he informed the Committee that Mr. Greenleaf was returning from Europe and that this matter would be brought to his attention; that the Officials of the District Government and members of the Board of Education present expressed their appreciation of the offer of the Commission of Fine Arts to assist in the matter, but that it was the desire of some of the members of the Committee that the planting in the school grounds be placed under the supervision of teachers, pupils and janitors, and that the District nursery could provide the necessary shrubbery and plants.

The Commission considered the matter with Mr. Greenleaf, who regarded it an interesting task. He said that for years the Commission has been advising as to plans for school buildings, but that landscape plans have been considered only incidentally in connection with them. Mr. Greenleaf concurred in the suggestion that a landscape architect be placed under the supervision of Mr. Harris and that it would be preferable to have the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks attend to the planting rather than janitors.

The Commission decided that Mr. Harris should submit to Mr. Greenleaf

such landscape plans as he may have ready, from time to time.

Mr. Harris submitted to Mr. Greenleaf a layout of plans for the following schools:

The Barnard School, 4th and Decatur Streets, N.W.
The Calvert Street School, at Calvert and 29th Street,
The Brightwood Park School, Ninth and Ingraham Streets, N.W.
The Brightwood School, 13th and Nicholson Street, N.W.
The Whittier School, 5th and Sheridan Streets, N.W.
The Washington Health School, 13th and Allison Streets, N.W.
The Janney School, at 41st and Albemarle Street, N.W.

Mr. Greenleaf approved the plans generally and the Commission concurred in the matter.

7. HOUDON BUST OF GEORGE WASHINGTON FOR THE PAN AMERICAN UNION: The Chairman read the following letter received from the Secretary of State regarding a suggestion to provide a Houdon bust of George Washington for the Pan American Union:

Department of State,
Washington, December 1, 1926.

"My dear Mr. Moore:

At the time of the completion of the Pan American Building a plan was agreed upon by which each of the American Republics would deposit in the Hall of the Americas of the Pan American Building, a marble bust of its leading statesman.

Public Resolution No.39 enacted by Congress at the last session and approved June 28, 1926, authorizes the Secretary of State to procure a replica of the Houdon Bust of George Washington in white marble with a suitable pedestal, and at a cost not to exceed the sum of $1,000, for lodgment in the Pan American Building in accordance with the plan mentioned. The Budget of the Department for 1928 contains an item of $1,000 for this purpose.

It is understood that a pedestal in the style uniform with those presented by other Governments will cost approximately $200, leaving approximately $800 with which to procure a replica of the Bust of Washington. As the Department is without information in regard to (1) the probable cost of making a replica in marble of the Houdon Bust of Washington in Mount Vernon, and (2) the name of a competent person or firm to whom the making of such a replica could be entrusted, it would be very grateful for any suggestions which the Fine Arts Commission might be willing to make to facilitate the presentation of the matter to Congress in connection with obtaining the appropriation and in carrying into effect appropriately the authorization of Congress.

I may say, in this relation, that the Department has received

a letter stating that there is in possession of the widow of Admiral Davenport a replica of the Houdon Bust in marble, which belonged to Lord Napier when he was British Minister to this country, and was given by him to Admiral Davenport's grandmother or mother. It is said that this Bust is in perfect condition, and that Mrs. Davenport would be willing to part with it for the purpose of having it placed in the Pan American Building. The Director General of the Pan American Union has, however, advised that it be examined by the sculptor member of the Fine Arts Commission before a decision on the subject should be reached. He points out that it is important to keep in mind the place designated for the Bust at the Pan American Union as this affects the finishing of the Bust, especially the rear portion of it. It is understood that this Bust may be inspected at any time, and it will be gratifying if an inspection of it could be made by the Commission, and its views upon the advisability of acquiring it communicated to the Department.

I am, my dear Mr. Moore,
Faithfully yours,
Frank B. Kellogg.

Mr. Moore said the question of securing a copy of the Houdon bust at Mount Vernon has been before the Mount Vernon Ladies Association for several years; that it was made by Houdon when he came to America in 1785; that it is the most faithful likeness of George Washington that there is. Mr. Moore said he had examined the bust with Mr. Adams and other sculptors and that they have urged upon the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association a reproduction of it so as to preserve this priceless art treasure against destruction. Mr. Moore said they won't allow it to be photographed, nor will allow anyone to do anything with it. They have not got to the point of reproducing it, but should grant the request of Congress to have it done.

Mr. Moore said there are hundreds of replicas but they all fall short of something. There is one in the Louvre that is a copy and there is one in the D. A. R. building, and there are others, but the translation loses something. Mr. Moore said Mr. Adams made a very careful examination of the Mount Vernon Houdon and felt a copy could be made of it. Mr. Mowbray

said"This is from life and it is a priceless thing. I would not like to see the cast made commonplace, although I would like to see a copy of the original cast made; but I do not think on the facts of the whole thing it could be done for $800,-$2,000 would be more to the point".

The Commission agreed that $2,000 was not an exhorbitant sum and that it would be advisable to get the views of the sculptor member of the Commission regarding the reproduction of it. A report was submitted to Secretary of State Kellogg (Exhibit B).

8. WAR DEPARTMENT INSIGNIA: Mr. DuBois, of the Office of the Quartermaster General, appeared before the Commission with from 16 to 20 sketches for proposed War Department Insignia, among them the following:

Proposed designs for Lapel Insignia for General Officers of the line (6 designs)
Designs for Soldier's Medal
Designs for Distinguished Flying Cross

Mr. DuBois said he hoped an early decision could be reached in the matter in view of the fact that the General Staff desires these Insignia as soon as possible.

The Commission inspected the sketches generally and Mr. DuBois was informed that a report would be submitted to the Quartermaster General concerning them.

Mr. Moore called attention to the task the Commission had during the World War to control this matter of production of Insignia for the Army and Navy and that in spite of obstacles that had to be overcome there were prepared under the supervision of the Commission such Insignia as the Discharged Soldiers of the World War Button, the Flying Corps Insignia, the Victory Medal; and also the Distinguished Service Cross and the Distinguished Service Medal of the Navy; that the War Department and the

Navy Department had come to the general agreement with the Commission that the Army and Navy insignia should be designed by a competent artist and not be the product of commercial manufacturers; that it requires the same skill to produce a good insignia as a good medal. Mr. Moore said he had learned that there is a division in the Office of the Quartermaster General costing something like $10,000 a year, which is absolute waste and should be abolished, as no insignia is produced by them having a standard of excellence.

The Commission disapproved the sketches submitted and decided to take up the matter directly with the Quartermaster General. (Exhibit C).

9. WORLD WAR CHAPELS AND MEMORIALS IN EUROPE:-Monument at Montfaucon: Major X. H. Price, Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, submitted three designs, prepared by Mr. John Russell Pope, architect, of New York City, for the World War Monument to be erected at Montfaucon. These are described by the architect, as follows:

> SCHEME NO.1: Consists of a simple wall about 22 feet high, containing a suitable inscription with a figure at each end against a pylon. On either side of this wall are flights of steps that allow access to the top of the hill and the ruins of the Church beyond.
>
> A forecourt raised several steps above the road level could have a map or device in the pavement, showing points of interest of the surrounding country.
>
> The level at the top of the wall, which is approximately the high point of the hill, would provide an excellent view of the map below for reference. No Memorial Room is provided in this scheme.
>
> SCHEME NO.2:--is a Doric column about 24 feet in diameter rising from a retaining wall in which is a door giving into a small Memorial Chamber and also for access to the top of the column. A forecourt is also provided with a map, as above, and whole is approached by a series of steps from the road level. The top of the retaining wall is approximately at the high point of the hill.
>
> SCHEME 3:--will allow of a somewhat larger Memorial Chamber than that for the column. It is designed to be erected almost entirely on the high point of the hill with an approach from the road below consisting of intervals of steps to afford an easier grade.
>
> This scheme resembles a truncated pyramid, like the tomb of Halicarnassus.

Major Price stated that this is to be the greatest of the World War Monuments and is to be erected at the place where the Americans did the greatest amount of fighting, although the French are not anxious to admit this. Major Price said this is also to be one of three great monuments in that fighting area, namely at Montfaucon, Chateau Thierry, and at Mont Sec; and that these monuments are to be properly coordinated.

The Commission inspected the designs and were inclined to favor design No.1 as being more appropriate as a war memorial, although it was recognized that the American Battle Monuments Commission felt the desirability of erecting the column, since many visitors who come to the locality would wish the opportunity of seeing the monument without having to climb up the hill.

Mr. Greenleaf said the monument should have from 10 to 20 acres for landscape development. Major Price said the monument will be the most important thing at the place as there is no town there, and that it will rise above the ruins of the old battle-scarred town.

The secretary stated that on Wednesday, December 1st, Mr. Medary had called at the Office of the American Battle Monuments Commission and inspected these designs, and at the same time was given an opportunity to talk with General Pershing on the whole subject of War Memorials in Europe, which he did for fully 1½ hours. The secretary stated further that General Pershing is very desirous that worthy memorials be erected in Europe and not such as will be offensive to the French; that General Pershing was strongly in favor of the column for Montfaucon, but that models of the proposed monuments should be made. Major Price called attention to the approved design for the Chateau Thierry Memorial, which is to measure 55' x 60', although Dr. Cret

is giving study to the question of reducing its scale somewhat. Major Price said that at St. Mihile the United States troops directed the operations, though the casualties were slight,-not like at Montfaucon where the fighting was tremendous in four or five different places and 1½ million Americans were engaged in battle.

The secretary stated that Mr. Medary regarded the column very appropriate for the Memorial as it represents the highest form of architecture; that it is the produc of an intellectual age, and has been used in many famous monuments of the world,-among them the Marcus Aurelius and the Trajan Column in Rome, the Column of the Place Vendome and the Colonne de Julliet, Paris, the Nelson Column in Trafalgar Square, the West Point Column, and our First Division Memorial, A. E. F.

The Commission considered design No.1 more in detail. Mr. Delano said this is the one which will cost the most, but that if for special reasons the memorial column should be erected that should be done. Major Price said the American Battle Monuments Commission has cut the number of memorials considerably and that they do not propose to spread the eagle unnecessarily but erect memorials which will in reality be such. The secretary said that Mr. Medary has suggested that models be made of the great memorials, with appropriate landscape setting, to determine their relative scale.

The Commission decided to give these designs further consideration in connection with others, in conference with the AmericanBattle MonumentsCommission.

10. FORT STEVENS: Under date of November 18, 1926, the following letter was received from Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Executive and Disbursing Officer of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, with reference to the purchase of additional land at Fort Stevens:

"The National Capital Park and Planning Commission favors the

acquiring for park purposes, by condemnation, the property extending from the north line of the land already acquired by the United States of America at the location of Fort Stevens, to the south line of Rittenhouse Street, as projected, including lots numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 804 in Square 2940, in the District of Columbia.

The advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to such acquisition is requested."

The Commission approved the acquirement of this area for the National Capital Park System. (Exhibit D).

11. WIDENING OF CONNECTICUT AVENUE: Under date of November 22, 1926, Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Executive and Disbursing Officer of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, submitted the following letter as to the widening of Connecticut Avenue at N Street and which affects the Longfellow and Witherspoon statues:

"In connection with the widening of Connecticut Avenue the District Commissioners have inquired as to the wishes of this office in regard to Reservations 150 and 150-A, on which are located the Longfellow and Witherspoon monuments.

Attached are copies of two memoranda from Major Brown, the engineer of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, on the subject.

The problem here is rather complicated, especially on Reservation 150-A where moving and lowering of the statue seems almost unavoidable. My own feeling is that these reservations can very well be left sticking out into Connecticut Avenue the width of one automobile, and then parking along the reservations' curbs be prohibited. This would leave the same clear space for traffic as there is throughout the rest of the adjacent part of Connecticut Avenue, since parking must be allowed along the stores and hotels that line both sides. Major Brown's second memorandum considers this possibility, but in his opinion the reservation would have to be narrowed three feet. It seems a pity to go to the expense of cutting and relaying the sidewalk and paving the increased width for so small a gain as three feet.

I have asked the District Commissioners to postpone any action in regard to these reservations for the present, believing that their special problem deserves further study. I should be very glad to have any suggestions that the Commission of Fine Arts may be able to make in regard to this question."

The Commission made an inspection of the site and after consideration approved the widening of Connecticut Avenue at this location. The Commission recommended that a pedestal and ground plan be made for the Witherspoon statue and also for the Longfellow statue (Exhibit E)

12. THE MALL DEVELOPMENT: Lieut. Col. Grant informed the Commission that he thought it desirable to begin carrying out the Mall, but upon taking up the matter with the Director of the Budget he had been unable to secure an appropriation for it since, he said, the Mall Plan had not been approved.

The Commission considered carefully the Mall development, and called attention to the fact that the Mall was designed as forming part of the central composition of Washington in the original L'Enfant Plan. When the Park Commission of 1901 resuscitated the L'Enfant Plan, after decades of neglect, and adapted that plan to the entire District of Columbia, the Pennsylvania Railroad demonstrated their interest in the National Capital,at an expense of millions of dollars, by moving their depot and railroad tracks from the Mall and relocating their terminal at the Union Station. Several public and semi-public buildings have been located on the Mall in accordance with the Mall Plan, as the Agricultural Department Building, the New National Museum, the Freer Gallery of Art and the George Washington Memorial Hall and Auditorium. Also Congress has authorized the erection of the National Gallery of Art on the Mall. The Grant Memorial was located at the head of the Mall largely through the instrumentality of Chief Justice Taft and Senator Elihu Root. President Roosevelt championed the carrying out of the Mall Plan by insisting that the new Agricultural Department building should be located in accordance with it, as well as such leaders in public life of that day as Senators McMillan, Gallinger, Wetmore and Newlands.

The Commission said that the Lincoln Memorial and the Relfecting Basin, constructed in accordance with the Mall Plan, gives an indication of the magnificence of the Mall when there will be walks and driveways leading directly from the Washington Monument to the Capitol, lined with trees and

an unbroken vista through the center of the Mall to the Capitol. The beauty of the Mall Plan will be still further enhanced by the Arlington Memorial Bridge, which has been located in accordance with the Plan of 1901. By extension of the Mall of the original L'Enfant Plan from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial, the Park Commission of 1901 designed one of the finest compositions of any city in the world, and brought into the park area of the National Capital fully 600 acres.

In view of all this the Commission earnestly expressed the desire that some action be taken soon to complete the Mall between the Capitol and the Washington Monument. The Commission advised that surveys have been made of the Mall and plans have been approved for roadways and walks in the Mall, which simply await an appropriation to carry them into execution, and that a formal approval of the Mall Plan was not necessary, since Congress has frequently enacted legislation looking to the completion of the Mall. The Commission expressed the desire that an appropriation to construct roads in the Mall be secured at this session of Congress (Exhibit F )

13. AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT WORLD WAR MEMORIAL: The Commission were informed by the Agricultural Department World War Memorial Committee that Mr. John Flanagan, sculptor, has promised them their full sized model by May 30, 1927, although his contract expired in May, 1925, and as there has been constant delay on his part in completing the work, they wished the advice of the Commission as to what should be done with regard to it.

The Commission decided to give the matter very careful consideration, and to inform the Agricultural Department World War Memorial Committee as to their recommendations.

14. COAST GUARD WORLD WAR MEMORIAL: The Coast Guard World War Memorial Committee submitted on November 3, 1926, a landscape plan for their memorial, to be erected in the Arlington National Cemetery. Mr. Greenleaf visited the location,-a large plot of ground designated for it by the War Department near the south entrance, and made recommendations concerning it, which were approved by the Commission (Exhibit G).

15. UNITED STATES FLAG STANDARDIZATION: In accordance with arrangements made for a further conference at the Bureau of Standards on the subject of United States Flag Standardization, Mr. H. Siddons Mowbray, painter member of the Commission of Fine Arts, attended such a conference in behalf of the Commission. Especial attention was given to the colors red and blue, and fabric, for the United States flag. Those present were: Dr. George K. Burgess, Director of the Bureau of Standards, presiding, Mr. Mowbray, Messrs. H. A. Ehrman and F. M. Hobson, of the Navy Department; Mr. Wm. H. Cady, Research Chemist, Pacific Mills, Lawrence, Mass.,; and the following also from the Bureau of Standards,-Mr. I. G. Priest, Color Expert, Mr. C. W. Schoffstall, Mr. W. D. Appel, Dye Expert, and Dr. C. E. Waters.

Mr. Appel read a report on"Dyes Suitable for the United States Flag" and exhibited dyeings and fastness tests. He pointed out that dyes which give the desired color and have the highest degree of fastness are available for cotton flags. A red for wool which is considerably faster than the present Navy Standard was also suggested but no blue dye for wool which has the desired color and also greater fastness than the proposed standard of the Commission could be found.

Mr. Ehrman and Mr. Schoffstahl pointed out that cotton flags do not "fly" as well as wool flags. It was suggested that if cotton flags were

made from mercerized cotton, or from cotton treated by a method which makes the fiber resemble wool, the flying properties might be improved. It was further suggested that waterproofing the cotton bunting would improve its flying behaviour.

Since cotton flags can be made that have the color desired by the Commission, and that are not only better but cheaper than the present wool flags, it was proposed that cotton, mercerized cotton, and water-proofed cotton flags dyed with fast colors be made and tried out under ordinary service conditions.

Mr. Mowbray submitted the following statement to the Commission:

> "The meeting at the Bureau of Standards on December 2nd was mainly concerned with the exhibition of a variety of results of different and new formulas for reds and blues. In the previous tests at the Navy Yard, New York, March 24, the blue was the weak color of the two. Since then a new formula has been used with the result that the latter color has shown very remarkable resistant power in the tests carried on in the Bureau of Standards. Also in the case of the red a stronger red has been obtained.
>
> The report of Dr. Burgess in regard to these proceedings has been given to you already. (Exhibit H).
>
> While two beautiful colors have thus been obtained which are also perfectly fast and in entire accordance with the samples furnished by the Commission of Fine Arts, they are, as yet, satisfactory only when used on cotton and silk. On woolen there is room for improvement.
>
> Cotton in its ordinary form is considered too light a material for flag use. It has the advantage, however, of being a clearer white than woolen and collects dirt and grime less readily.
>
> An experiment will be tried on a heavy mercerized cotton in the next tests.
>
> The next step at the Bureau of Standards will be to have the Navy Department make four (4) flags of the same dimensions--i.e. cotton, mercerized cotton, woolen, and the present standard. These will be then submitted to the usual six weeks' test at the Brooklyn Navy Yard as soon as possible.

Mr. Mowbray informed the Commission that the suggestion of the Bureau of Standards as to using mercerized cotton would mean a great improvement in

the appearance of United States flags, and would be apt to revolutionize the flag production industry. The Commission were much pleased with the samples submitted by Mr. Mowbray of the red and blue that had been agreed upon by the Committee, noting a great difference in the colors of red and blue now used, and complimented Mr. Mowbray on the results thus far achieved.

16. POLICE COURT BUILDING: The secretary reported that in accordance with arrangements made the Committee of Judges of the District Supreme Court, which included Hon. Gus. A. Schuldt, Presiding Judge of the Police and Traffic Courts, and Hon. Walter I. McCoy, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, the judges were expecting the Commission during the afternoon at the office of Chief Justice McCoy to consider further the location of the proposed new Police Court Building.

Mr. Moore said, however, that as the Municipal Architect, Mr. Harris, had advised he had no funds for making a sketch of the new building, which was desired by the Chief Justice, he felt the Commission could do nothing further in the matter for the present, and that he would inform Chief Justice McCoy accordingly.

(The urgent need of the proposed new police court building caused Representative Ernest W. Gibson, Chairman of the District of Columbia Investigation Committee, to ask Mr. Moore to make a statement on the subject before that Committee on December 4, 1926, which he did, giving the reason above stated, in connection with a general statement on the needs of the National Capital in the development of projects, which was much appreciated by the Committee. Subsequently, on December 7, 1926, the Chairman and the Secretary, representing the Commission, held a meeting with the District Supreme Court Judges, at which it was determined that the new Police Court Building should be located in the southeast section of Judiciary Square, at the intersection of Fourth and E Streets, where it would balance the Court of Appeals Building. A report of the meeting is attached to these Minutes and made a part thereof (Exhibit I).

17. FORT MONMOUTH BARRACKS: In connection with plans submitted by the

War Department the Commission considered the question of design of buildings proposed for erection by the War Department in their army posts throughout the United States, in accordance with such a building program which that Department proposes to carry out as Congress provides funds for it. Mr. Moore called attention to the fine barracks and houses for Army Officers here at the War College, in contrast with an ordinary design for the proposed buildings at Fort Monmouth, and raised the question whether or not plans for buildings should continue to be designed under existing methods in the Office of the Quartermaster General, or whether an architectural adviser should be appointed by the Quartermaster General to supervise these building plans.

Mr. Delano said he felt the Quartermaster General would prefer to submit the plans to the Commission as they are prepared for advice. The Chairman designated Mr. Delano as a Committee of one to confer with the Quartermaster General with regard to the matter.

18. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: Under date of December 1, 1926, Lieut.Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Executive and Disbursing Officer of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, submitted the following letter, which the Commission considered carefully at the meeting:

> "It is noticed that the plan received from the Commission of Fine Arts for the treatment of the roads in the vicinity of the Virginia terminal of the Arlington Memorial Bridge indicate a material shortening of the main parkway in continuation of the axis of the bridge itself and leading to the so called "Memorial Entrance" of the Arlington Cemetery"
>
> I am personally inclined to favor some such modification of the original plan, as approved by Congress. However, such a modification can hardly be accepted without very careful study, a full presentation to the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, and definite action by the said Commission. As there is a great deal of interest in working out the various connections between the existing road sytem in Virginia and the bridge approaches, it seems that it would be advisable to take up now any features of the bridge project which should be reconsidered.
>
> I would be very happy to have the suggestions and recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts on the subject."

The matter was brought to the special attention of Mr. Greenleaf, who

submitted the following statement and recommendations:

"Now is the strategic time for the thorough study and presentation of plans of the Arlington Memorial Bridge development, at each end of the bridge, in its broadest aspect.

The consistent and altogether desirable thing is that both ends of the bridge be included in the studies made by McKim, Mead and White, and considered by them as part of their design and development of the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

The Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission should look upon the adequate design and treatment of these two approaches as no second in importance to the bridge itself.

When we come to a more specific statement--The critical thing now is to insure adequate handling of the Washington end, of which there are these fundamentals:--

A very splendid and extremely symmetrical development of the Water Gate, strictly symmetrical with the axis.

An axis of the Mall with a lop-sided progression of a very marked architectural treatment in the form of the bridge proper,-that in order to fully meet the situation and design it is a very essential part of the treatment that the retaining wall touched by the river along its length running from the staircase upstream, be treated architecturally rather than in the engineering sense, so that it will come up in importance to balance the architecture of the bridge, and that means not that it shall consist of ~~high arches and architecturally~~ looming high in the air, but that it shall have ~~itself shady lines,-- its piers, its~~ scale, in harmony with the bridge scale. It means above all that it shall not stop weakly at some indeterminate point a little removed from the end of the water stairs, but that it shall continue in progression to an adequate architectural demonstration at the river end of B Street North extended. Attention is called to the fact that the official plan presented by McKim Mead and White includes B Street.

B. It is of vital importance that there be no invasion of the Arlington National Cemetery by a terminal, as contemplated by the original location plan, and that the Virginia Terminal of the Arlington Memorial Bridge be brought nearer to the river, as indicated in the Greater Arlington Plan. At the same time the Commission recommend that the stretch from the end of the bridge proper, on Columbia Island, to the Virginia shore, <u>be treated as a whole in one study</u>, by the architects of the bridge.

C. It will be noted that the Greater Arlington Plan suggests two roadways, each extending north and south from the Memorial Bridge at the Virginia shore. The first of these is the cross axis proper,-"The Virginia Shore Parkway", extending south into Columbia Island and extending further south as the Mount Vernon Boulevard; and up river

towards Analostan Island, and continuing up the river as the Virginia Shore Parkway into Rosslyn and ultimately beyond to Great Falls. The second, as a subordinate matter, there comes a line of travel which more or less follows the line of the railroad, which is to be carried entirely under the bridge plaza and the approach to Arlington, even as the railroad is to be carried entirely underneath; and instead of conveying the impression that there are two lines of equal importance in the parking scheme and approach we have one line. This is of extreme importance, for the second roadway extending north and south from the Virginia terminal of the memorial bridge is to be simply a traffic line, which is suppressed and out of sight, passing through a tunnel or subway under the bridge approach development.

The architects should include in their study the conception of an adequate approach and entrance to Arlington National Cemetery. If possible, everything included in that entrance should be part of the construction which they are now undertaking. If there are official reasons why this entrance treatment cannot be part of their contracts it is strongly urged that its study should be undertaken by the architects in order that the composition as a whole may be notable and adequate."

The Commission concurred in the recommendations of Mr. Greenleaf. Attention was called to the fact that the Greater Arlington Plan, as approved by the Secretary of War, contemplates bringing in both shores and the islands of the Potomac, from the Francis Scott Key Bridge to the Long Bridge, into the National Capital Park System.

The Commission recommended that with the adoption of the Greater Arlington Plan these recommendations pertaining to the Memorial Bridge be adopted by the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission.

A report was sent to the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission (Exhibit J).

19. SUCCESSOR TO MR. MEDARY: The secretary reported that the four year term of service of Mr. Milton B. Medary, Jr., architect member of the Commission, expired today, December 2, 1926, and that he had asked that the Commission suggest another architect to take his place, especially because of the fact that the President had appointed him a member of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and as he was serving as President of the American Institute of Architects. The Commission regretted very much that Mr. Medary should

leave the Commission of Fine Arts at this time and favored his reappointment. However, to comply with Mr. Medary's wishes that he be relieved of some of his official duties, the Commission considered the names of other architect members of the profession, and unanimously agreed to suggest to the President the appointment of Benjamin Wistar Morris, architect of New York City, and a former member of the Art Commission of New York City.

20. MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The secretary stated that Mr. Taft had expressed his regret at being unable to attend this meeting of the Commission, becauseof a Lecture engagement out west, and that at the suggestion of the secretary he had given dates when he could attend meetings of the Commission of Fine Arts, as follows:

January: Any Friday morning and any Thursday morning, excepting the 27th.
February 17 and 18
March: Any Saturday.
April: 14-15; 21 and 23 (not 22d); April 28, 29, 30.

The secretary reported that Mr. Taft will be in Washington to give a "Clay Talk" before the Washington Society of Fine Arts on the evening of March 16th. Upon the suggestion of the Commission that the meeting for the month of March be held on that day, this matter was taken up with Mr. Taft, who has advised that "the 16th will be admirable".

The following dates have therefore been agreed upon for holding meetings of the Commission of Fine Arts:

Thursday, January 6th;
Thursday, February 17th;
Wednesday, March 16th;
Thursday, April 14th.

The Commission had as their guest at the luncheon Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital. After the luncheon the Commission inspected with him the Witherspoonand the Longfellow statues, at Connecticut Avenue and N Streets, in connection with the question of widening the Avenue at this location. Thereupon the Commission returned to the Commission rooms to resume the session, and adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

COPY

December 2, 1926.

Sir:

We, the undersigned, members of the Commission of Fine Arts in session at a meeting today, respectfully recommend to you that Mr. Charles Moore, whose term of service has expired, be reappointed to succeed himself as a member of the Commission. In our opinion Mr. Moore is best informed of any one in Washington in matters pertaining to the development of the National Capital.

Very respectfully,

(Signed) James L. Greenleaf,
H. Siddons Mowbray,
Wm. Adams Delano
Abram Garfield.

The President,
The White House.

COPY

December 8, 1926.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

Your letter of December 1st as to procuring a copy of the Houdon bust of Washington at Mount Vernon, for presentation to the Pan American Union, brings up some very interesting questions. The opportunity is thus opened for accomplishing a great service to both art and history.

The Houdon bust at Mount Vernon is the best likeness of George Washington in existence. Selected by Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin, who were then in France, Houdon, the greatest sculptor of his day, came to America with his helpers to make a direct study of George Washington for the purpose of executing a standing figure of Washington for the State of Virginia. He would not have made the voyage had it not been for an implied promise that he should also do an equestrian statue of Washington, probably the one authorized by the Continental Congress and located at the junction of the axis of the Mall with the axis of the White House in the L'Enfant Plan. By mischance the material for Houdon's work missed the ship in France and he was compelled to improvise the requisites from what he could find at Alexandria.

Jean Antoine Houdon arrived at Mount Vernon at 11 o'clock Sunday night October 2, 1785, after the family were in bed. He brought with him three young men assistants. He spent most of the week studying his subject. Washington records in his diary---

Friday, October 7, Sat today, as I had done yesterday, for Mr. Houdon to form my bust.

Sunday, October 9. Accompanied by Mr. Houdon and the two Mr. Bassetts attended the funeral of Mrs. Manley at the plantation of Mr. William Triplett and returned to dinner.

Monday, October 10. Observed the process of preparing the Plaister of Paris and mixing of it according to Mr. Houdon. The oven being made hotter than it is usually heated for bread; the plaister which had previously been broken into lumps, that which was hard to about the size of a pullets egg; and that which was soft, and could be broken with the hands, larger; was put in about noon and remained until night; when upon examination it was further continued until the morning without any renewal of the heat in the oven, which was close stopped. Having been sufficiently calcined by this operation it was pulverized (in an iron mortar) and sifted for use through a fine sieve, and kept from wet. When used it is put into a Bason or other vessel with water; sifted through the fingers, till the water is made as thick as Loblolly or very thick like cream. As soon as the plaister is thus put into the water it is beat with an iron spoon (almost flat) until it is well mixed and must be immediately applied to the purpose for which it is intended with a brush or whatever else best answers, as it begins to turn hard in four or five minutes and in seven or ten cannot be used, and is fit for no purpose afterwards as it will not bear wetting a second time. For this reason no more must be mixed at a time than can be used

within the space just mentioned. The brush (common painters) must be put into water as soon as it is used, and the plaister well squeezed out, or this also becomes hard. In this case, to clean it, it must be beaten until the plaister is reduced to a powder and then washed.

Wednesday, October 12, In the evening Mr. Madison arrived.
Friday, October 14. Mr. Madison went away after breakfast.
Wednesday, October 19. Mr. Houdon having finished the business which brought him hither went up on Monday with his people, work and impliments in my barge to Alexandria to take a passage in the stage for Philadelphia the next morning.

Whether Houdon made a life mask of Washington or not can only be inferred from the foregoing. Mr. Madison gives us no information on the subject. Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan has what is believed to be a life mask made by Houdon at this time. The bust at Mount Vernon was cast from the clay model made by Houdon at Mt. Vernon. The bust contains more of the individual features of Washington than any painting or other bust ever made.

The fact that these elements of individuality were observed and recorded by a master of sculpture who had sufficient time fully to study his subject makes this particular bust surpassingly satisfactory so far as an authentic portrait is concerned. The bust itself is exhibited under glass in the relic room at Mount Vernon. The building is fireproof, but the bust is exposed with the chances of great crowds who visit it daily in a very contracted space. If by any mischance it should be overthrown and broken the loss would be irreparable. During the past four or five years the Regents of Mount Vernon have had before them the question of an adequate reproduction of the bust, whether indirectly by a sculptor of ability and appreciation, or by a direct cast. Such a reproduction seems to be the duty laid upon the Regents of Mount Vernon, for they have one of the most precious documents relating to Washington, and its continued existence is precarious. This important project of the Government to present a copy of the bust to the Pan American Union may be an opportunity to secure action by the Regents, who have long been hesitating. The Regents naturally have the feeling that the bust should not be made common by frequent reproductions; but a reproduction to be made at the instance of the Government of the United States places the matter on an entirely different footing, and they may see in the occasion an opportunity both to do service to the country and at the same time place beyond the possibility of destruction this treasure which they hold in trust for the people of the United States.

The amount of $1,000 mentioned in your letter is not adequate to obtain a reproduction of the bust in a satisfactory manner. $200 will be the cost of the pedestal. A safe sum for the study and reproduction of the bust at Mount Vernon, for it should not be removed, would be $2,000, including the cost of the pedestal.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,
Charles Moore,
Chairman.

The Honorable
Frank B. Kellogg,
Secretary of State.

COPY

December 8, 1926.

Dear General Cheatham:

The Commission of Fine Arts were much interested in the numerous designs for insignia which were submitted by Mr. DuBois at the meeting on December 2d.

During the World War the Commission of F ine Arts gave extended and careful attention to the question of Army and Navy insignia. Owing to the hurry and excitement of those days the Commission were not able to accomplish much, but they did secure good designs for the Discharged S oldiers of the World War Insignia, the Flying Corps Insignia, the Victory M edal; and also the Distinguished Service Cross and the Distinguished Service Medal of the Navy.

On careful study of the subject with Colonel Robert E. Wyllie, representing the General Staff of the Army, the precedent was started of having insignia designed by artists of the highest class. This was done with the view of bringing the United States insignia up to the standard of E uropean nations.

It was a disappointment to the Commission to have presented to them a large number of designs on which a great amount of time had been spent, but no one of which reached a standard of excellence consistent with the dignity of the service. It seemed to the Commission a sad waste of time spent on the production of decorations having no artistic merit.

The designs are returned without approval. For the Commission;
Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major General B. F. Cheatham,
The Quartermaster General,
War Department.

EXHIBIT C.

COPY

December 3, 1926.

Dear Colonel Grant:

Your letter of November 18th, concerning the acquisition of an additional area to the Fort Stevens reservation, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on December 2, 1926. The Commission approve the acquisition of this area, as outlined in your letter, by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, for the National Capital Park System.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive Officer,
National Capital Park and Planning Commission,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT D

COPY

December 3, 1926.

Dear Colonel Grant:

Your letter of November 22, regarding the widening of Connecticut Avenue, near the Longfellow and Witherspoon monuments, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on December 2, 1926. The Commission made an inspection of the location and recommend the following:

The Commission favor the widening of Connecticut Avenue near the monuments above mentioned. The Witherspoon statue should be made to sit on an island in the pavement of the street; but a study should be made so as to avoid clumsiness of treatment.

The Longfellow monument should not have any grass plot around it. One set of trees will be eliminated by the widening of the Avenue. There will remain an inner row of trees near the monument, under which benches should be placed. If flagging is used instead of pavement, it will be more restful to the people who come to the monument.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director,
Public Buildings and Public Parks
of the National Capital,
Washington, D.C.

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

The Commission approve strongly that the parking regulations should forbid parking of automobiles along curbs near statues, and suggest that you bring this matter to the attention of the District authorities.

EXHIBIT E.

COPY

December 8, 1926.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts know that you are just as anxious for the completion of the Mall Plan as anyone is, and we understand fully your feeling in regard to the fact that the Mall Plan has not been formally approved as a whole. The time may have come now when a general approval can be obtained from Congress, but it seems hardly worth the effort, inasmuch as all of the elements of the Mall Plan have been approved. The Commission hope that at this session of Congress you can get an appropriation for putting in such roads as are already laid out and the foundations of which are already in.

The Commission suggest further that you open up the driveways on either side of the heating plant in the Mall. If you get thus far this year you will joinx the development of that portion of the Mall surrounding the Meade Memorial and will make a great start towards the entire development.

For the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive Officer,
National Capital Park and Planning Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT F

COPY

December 3, 1926.

Dear Commander Wheeler:

The landscape plan for the Coast Guard World War Memorial, which you submitted with your letter of November 3, was brought to the particular attention of Mr. James L. Greenleaf, Landscape Architect member of the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 2, 1926. Mr. Greenleaf inspected the location in the Arlington National Cemetery and regards the plan as a whole entirely satisfactory, but would suggest the following;

The cedars selected should be really fine specimens, such as the arbor vitae pyramidalis, densely planted so as to form a magnificent background for the memorial. Back of the cedars he would prefer only one kind of planting, either the rhododendron or laurel, planted on ground graded to a height of two feet so as to form a mass against the cedars. The existing tree on the area might well be removed, and four or five good sized trees planted, such as lindens or elms.

The Commission concur in the recommendations of Mr. Greenleaf. Of course, there will be time to attend to details of the planting plan after the memorial is in place.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Commander Wm. J. Wheeler,
Chairman, Coast Guard
World War Memorial Committee,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT G.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF STANDARDS

WASHINGTON

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
WASHINGTON, D. C.
DEC 4 1926
NOTED
IN YOUR REPLY REFER TO FILE NO.
V-3

ADDRESS REPLY TO
BUREAU OF STANDARDS
WDA:LLF

December 3, 1926.

The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Flag Report.

Gentlemen:

Herewith is transmitted a report on "Dyes Suitable for the United States Flag" which was read at the meeting of the Commission at the Bureau on December 2, 1926.

Respectfully,

George K. Burgess, Director.

Enclosure:

Report.

(Exhibit H)

Form 259

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

# Bureau of Standards

WDA:LLF
V-3

## REPORT
on
Dyes Suitable For The
United States Flag.

1. INTRODUCTION:

The Bureau of Standards submitted a written report to the Commission of Fine Arts on December 9, 1925, in which it was shown that the proposed standard red and blue bunting recommended by the Commission for the United States Flag could be readily produced commercially. This was based on the assumption that the proposed bunting was of satisfactory fastness, as it had been found to be in laboratory tests by the Navy Department. Practical flying tests conducted at the Brooklyn Navy Yard from March 10 to May 6, 1926, with flags made from the proposed standard bunting and from the present Navy Standard bunting indicated that the proposed blue was not sufficiently resistant to fading. All of the flags showed a distinct deterioration in color in these tests. At the meeting of the Commission at the Bureau on May 27, 1926, the question of obtaining faster colors was referred to the Bureau. The answer is given here.

2. COTTON FLAGS:

Cotton flags will be considered first because eminently suitable dyestuffs are available for them.

Blue. Herewith is submitted a dyeing (No. 1) of 6% indanthrene blue GCD double paste and 6% indanthrene brilliant blue R paste. It is a fine bright blue very close to the desired color and is of the highest degree of fastness to light, washing, water, and salt water obtainable. It will withstand months of exposure to sunlight without fading and in addition may be washed repeatedly.

Red. The red cotton bunting (No. 1) submitted herewith was dyed with the ice color known as naphthol AS-RL coupled with a mixture of fast red salt GL and fast scarlet salt GG. It is one of the fastest cotton reds. The indanthrene red dyes which exceed this one in fastness produce too dull a color. (See No. 11 on the Light Test Card.) It is believed that this dye will withstand the most severe service test satisfactorily.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Since these cotton dyes are decidedly faster than the wool dyes which will produce the desired color, the use of cotton flags for severe service suggests itself. Cotton flags do not fly as well as wool flags. Mercerized cotton might fly better than ordinary cotton and would certainly have a brighter color.

3. WOOL FLAGS:

Red. In order to obtain a red on wool that is faster to light than the present and the proposed standard bunting a somewhat duller color would have to be used. Sample No. 8 submitted by the Arlington Mills is satisfactory. It was probably produced with alizarine red S. Intermediate in color between this and the very bright red No. 4 is No. 3, dyed with feaco red G, which appears to be somewhat faster to light than the proposed standard. The Arlington Mills red (No. 8) is the only one which can be recommended for the most severe service requirements.

The brightest and relatively the most fugitive red on wool, erie scarlet B, No. 2, or polar red No. 4, is considered a color match for No. 1, recommended for cotton. If the color of these samples is designated as standard for the flag, then the Arlington Mills red, No. 8, might have to be considered as within the allowable limits of variation in color. This tolerance could be limited to wool service flags. Cotton service flags and wool or silk decorative flags could be required to match the standard within much narrower limits. If the Arlington Mills type of red is designated as standard, it will be easy to match the color on cotton.

Blue. No thoroughly satisfactory wool blue having the desired color or even approaching it has been found. If the proposed blue is adopted as standard cotton flags of great fastness may be had, but wool flags will fade under severe service conditions. The proposed blue is little, if any, less fast than the Navy Standard. The difference is that a change of color in the Navy Standard is less obvious. In order to obtain better fastness than that of the Navy Standard blue a heavy dark blue would have to be used.

4. SPECIFICATION:

A color specification for the flag would have to be based in the first instance on a dyed sample. The dyeings submitted with this report were made in the laboratory and are not suitable for standards. A piece dyed and finished in the mill should be selected for the standard.

In writing the specification consideration must be given the fact that colors which match when viewed in daylight may not in artificial light. This is illustrated by the samples of blue bunting submitted with this report. It is of special importance when flags are to be used indoors.

A fundamental color specification such as is illustrated in the report of the Colorimetry Section of the Bureau on "Colors being considered as standard for the United States Flag", dated

September 16, 1926, would serve as a permanent record of the colors and make possible their reproduction at some future time. In practice, as at the present time, the standard sample of bunting would be used to define the color and its fastness properties also. It is considered unwise to specify any particular dyestuff for the flag, though the dyes used on the initial batch of bunting from which the standard is taken should be known, so that ready duplication will be possible.

5. APPENDIX:

Quotations from correspondence regarding dyes for the Flag. The numbers in parenthesis are our references to the Light Test Card.

1. Letter of May 21, 1926 from Mr. Wm. D. Livermore, Chief Chemist, American Woolen Co.

"I should say that alizarine light blue R of the Sandoz Company, (No. 9), or alizarine sapphire blue R, (No. 7) of the Ciba Company will match your shade of blue very closely and should be as fast as anything you can get in this shade, to light."

2. Letter of September 25, 1926, from Du Pont de Nemours and Company.

"Unfortunately, we have nothing in our line which would even approximate the shade desired and give any better fastness than Du Pont alizarine saphirole SE, so that we are unable to make another recommendation at this time."

3. Letter of July 19, 1926 from Arlington Mills, and written by Mr. Hugh Christison, Chief Chemist.

"On March 24, 1926, we sent Mr. Wm. D. Appel, Bureau of Standards, cloth dyed with what practically is the old Turkey Red dyed on wool instead of the usual cotton, (No. 8). We believe this to be the best and fastest red extant. ******** Our tests show this to be faster than either the Fine Arts Commission (No. 5) or the Navy Standard (No. 6). It is not quite as bright as the shade selected by the Fine Arts Commission, but after a few days in the sun the alizarine red we submit is so markedly superior to the others that there is hardly any comparison.

"As to the Blue. The sample selected by the Fine Arts Commission (No. 10) would not be our choice of a pleasing blue because in artificial light it changes from its daylight shade to a color not attractive. The only way this blue can be matched is by acid dyes. No acid dyes we know of will give satisfaction on bunting for flags, especially for this bright shade. Our recommendation for dyeing the blue is to vat dye using bromo-indigo (No. 8). The color is much brighter than the present Navy Standard. All its fastness tests show superiority to anything else.

"Practicability of Application. At this mill we are of the opinion that both should be dyed before the wool is spun in order to get perfect evenness and color matching, although there is a possibility that the red might be satisfactorily piece dyed. We have dyed here both shades with the dyes recommended successfully.

"Cost. The cost of dyeing the bunting as advocated would be about three times that now done. This means that a yard of ordinary bunting 36" wide and weighing 4 ounces would cost 15 cents more. This would take care of the added expense of dyeing before spinning and the more expensive dye. It is not the writer's business to quote prices, and the figure given is approximate. If there is a real demand for a better dyed bunting at an increased price, let us know.

"Our president and agent feel that probably the Government would not pay this extra price and would prefer to buy of a mill producing piece dyed bunting."

4. Letter of November 9, 1926. General Dyestuff Corporation.

This company submitted red wool bunting sample No. 7, acid anthracene red 3BL and stated "The red on wool bunting is slightly bluer in shade but we are inclined to think that this will offer no objection; as in order to match the desired shade exactly, such colors as possess less fastness to light would have to be used, we have refrained from doing so."

## 6. LIST OF DYEINGS TO ACCOMPANY THE REPORT ON DYES SUITABLE FOR THE UNITED STATES FLAG.

### Red

| No. | Name | Strength | Manufacturer |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | naphthol AS-RL<br>fast red salt GL<br>fast scarlet salt GG | 8 grams per liter<br>6 grams per liter<br>18 grams per liter | General |
| 2 | national erie scarlet B | 1.25% | Nat'l Aniline |
| 3 | feaco red G | 2.5% | Atteaux |
| 4 | polar red G conc.<br>polar red R conc. | 1 lb. 3 oz., 88 grains<br>4 oz., 350 " | Geigy |
| 5 | Fine Arts Commission Standard (RED) | | |
| 6 | Navy Standard (RED) | | |
| 7 | acid anthracene red 3BL | 3.0% | General |
| 8 | flag red | | Arlington Mills |

Report on Dyes for Flag. - # 5.

## Blue

| No. | Name | Strength | Manufacturer |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | indanthrene blue GCD dbl. paste<br>indanthrene brilliant blue R paste | 6.0%<br>6.0% | General |
| 2 | ciba blue 2B powder (on cotton) | 4.0% | Ciba |
| 3 | ponsol blue RS paste | 12.0% | Du Pont |
| 4 | anthrene blue RS 10% paste | 15.0% | Newport |
| 5 | alizarine saphirole SE | 0.9% | Du Pont |
| 6 | cyananthrol RXO<br>alizarine brilliant sky blue R | 0.42%<br>0.58% | General |
| 7 | alizarine sapphire blue R | 1.5% | Ciba |
| 8 | ciba blue 2B powder (on wool) | 2.0% | Ciba |
| 9 | alizarine light blue R | 2.0% | Sandoz |
| 10 | Fine Arts Commission Standard (Blue) | | |
| 11 | Navy Standard (Blue) | | |

Respectfully submitted,

George K. Burgess, Director.

Washington, D. C.

December 2, 1926.

Washington, D. C.,
December 7, 1926.

MINUTES OF
MEETING TO DETERMINE ON SITE FOR POLICE COURT BUILDING

A meeting was held at the Office of Chief Justice McCoy of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, at 4:00 o'clock, Tuesday, December 7, 1926, to determine upon a site for the new police court building, contemplated by the act approved July 3, 1926 (Public No.515, 69th Congress), as follows:

"BE IT ENACTED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be authorized and instructed to enter into contracts for the erection of a building for the use of the police court of the District of Columbia: Provided, That the location, plans, and specifications for such building shall be approved by the Fine Arts Commission and by the chief justices of said police courts and Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

Sec.2. That there is hereby authorized an appropriation for the erection of said building to be appropriated in like manner as other expenses of the District of Columbia."

The meeting was attended by Chief Justice Walter I. McCoy, of the District Supreme Court, Hon. Gus. A. Schuldt, Presiding Judge of the Police and Traffic Courts of the District of Columbia, Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman, and Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary, of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The meeting was called at the request of Chief Justice McCoy, who felt it very desirable to have a final settlement of the question of locating the new Police Court building, for until then an appropriation could not be secured, and he interpreted the act above quoted to mean that the Commission of Fine Arts, the Presiding Judge of the Police Court, and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, had been empowered by Congress to select a site.

Mr. Caemmerer thereupon called attention to the letter from the Commission of Fine Arts of June 18, 1926, approving the location of the police court building in Judiciary Square, and while the suggestion was made at that time to locate the building along Fifth Street, between E and F Streets, as prolonged into the Square, the Commission still favored the location of the building in Judiciary Square, although the question has now arisen whether the police court building should be located, instead of along Fifth Street, at one of the following locations:

1. At the southeast corner of Judiciary Square, near the intersection of Fourth and E Streets, N.W., where the building would balance the Court of Appeals Building.
2. Opposite the District Supreme Court Building, so as to take it out of Judiciary Square.
3. At a site suggested by the District Commissioners' Office, south of the present Municipal Building.

Judge Schuldt said the site proposed south of the Municipal Building at Fourteenth and Pennsylvania Avenue, should be discarded, since the Police Court of the District is a Federal Police Court, the only one of its kind in this Country, and that its relations with the District Supreme Court are of such great importance that the Police Court Building should be located in its immediate vicinity; [redacted] that he had talked with Representative Zihlman, Chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, about the matter; that Mr. Zihlman favored locating the building in Judiciary Square, and that he regarded it inadvisable to ask Congress to appropriate money for buying a site; also that Mr. Gibson, in charge of the House Investigation Committee of District affairs, at the present time, had urged that the necessary steps be taken to secure the police court building without delay.

Mr. Moore called attention to the inspection made by the Commission of Fine Arts, with Chief Justice McCoy and Judge Schuldt, of the site near Fourth and E Streets, during the meeting of the Commission on October 14, 1926, at which that location was regarded favorably by the Commission for the new building; and that thereupon, at the suggestion of Chief Justice McCoy, effort was made to secure a lay out of the proposed new building from the Municipal Architect, Mr. Harris, for consideration at the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on December 2, 1926, but that Mr. Harris had advised that in the absence of funds for making plans for the building he could not provide the desired sketch.

Mr. Caemmerer read the following letter which he received from Mr. Harris, dated November 16, 1926, as follows:

> "Replying to your letter of October 22nd, with reference to the preparation of sketches for a police court building on the east of the present District Court Building, you are advised that I will not be able to submit to you at the next meeting of the Fine Arts Commission the sketches you desire. In view of the fact that Congress failed to make an appropriation, I am without funds for the preparation of these sketches. After consulting with Colonel Bell, it was decided that we should not use money intended for school work to pay for these drawings.
>
> "I am returning herewith the photographs which you accompanied with your letter."

Mr. Caemmerer said, upon receiving this letter from Mr. Harris he talked with Judge Schuldt about the matter, and asked if some one at the Police Court could draw a rough sketch, showing a layout for a building at the Fourth and E Streets site, for a building to comprise an area of "approximately 66,900 square feet, not including the basement area", as had been recommended by the Police Court Justices; that Judge Schuldt had succeeded in getting Chief Deputy Clerk R. L. Humphrey of the Police Court to make such a sketch, who thereupon called at the Office of the Commission of Fine Arts to talk with Mr. Caemmerer about the sketch. It was ascertained that the Court of Appeals building is 125 feet long, north and south, and 100 feet 8 inches, east and west, and 60 feet high to the highest part of the roof; that the

sketch submitted by Mr. Humphrey called for a Police Court Building 145' x 125', but as no data was given as to the height of the proposed building Mr. Caemmerer asked if he could furnish this. Also, Mr. Caemmerer said he called the attention of Mr. Humphrey to a clipping from the Washington Star of November 13, 1923, in which the design of a "Recorder of Deed Building", made in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, had been published as having been prepared for that site, under authority to make plans for an addition to the City Hall, as provided in the District Appropriation Act of 1923. Mr. Humphrey said he would furnish the data as to height of the new building, and look into the question of plans for a "Recorder of Deeds Building", which he did, and informed Mr. Caemmerer by letter dated November 13, 1926, as follows:

"I am informed that the Court of Appeals has a facade sixty feet high. Adding another story to the floor plans of the proposed building for the Police Court we find that its height would be seventy feet, allowing ceilings of fifteen feet for the first or street floor, twenty feet for the main court floor, fifteen feet for the next court floor, ten feet for the floor consisting of chambers and library, and ten feet for construction. Such a building would contain two basement levels as shown on the plans which you have. If located with a frontage on E street and on the building line of the Court of Appeals the difference of ten feet in the height of the two buildings would not be noticeable.

"In reading the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1923 it does not appear that the language therein instructing the Architect of the Capitol to draw plans for an addition to the City Hall could be construed as authorizing a site for a building to be used by the Recorder of Deeds. This language merely instructed the architect to draw these plans and submit them to Congress with an estimate for such additions. This was done and presented to Congress at its next session when the bill was defeated.

Thanking you again for your courteous hearing, I am---"

Chief Justice McCoy asked whether the dimensions were at hand of the building which had been designed in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol. Mr. Caemmerer submitted a photostat copy of the First Floor Plan of that design to the Chief Justice, which indicated that that building was to be 180 feet long by 134 feet wide, as compared to 145' x 125' of the proposed new Police Court Building, at the site in question, Fourth and E Streets, N.W.

Judge Schuldt said that the Justices of the Police Court favor the Fourth and E Street site. Chief Justice McCoy said he would favor that site provided the Commission of Fine Arts approves it, but that personally he would prefer a site for the building across the street, so as to avoid taking up ground in Judiciary Square. Mr. Moore said he could speak positively for the Commission of Fine Arts that they favor the Fourth and E Street site as a proper location for a new building in Judiciary Square, to balance the Court of Appeals Building. Mr. Moore said as far back as 1901 Judiciary Square had been looked upon as an appropriate place for grouping judicial buildings in the District of Columbia; that the site along Fifth Street for

the new Police Court Building had suggested itself last June because it was thought another building was contemplated for the Fourth and E Street site and also because a building along Fifth Street might result in saving a few more trees than at the former site.

Chief Justice McCoy asked Mr. Moore whether a building at Fourth and E Street could be designed for the Police Court so as to be harmonious with the main District Supreme Court Building and with the Court of Appeals building, and Mr. Moore replied that he was certain that this could be done (and as was indicated by the sketch of Mr. Lynn, Architect of the Capitol for a proposed addition to the "City Hall", heretofore referred to).

Thereupon, the Committee being fully agreed that an appropriate building for the Police Court could be built at the Fourth and E Street site in Judiciary Square, unanimously decided that the new Police Court building should be located at that location. The Committee decided further that Judge Schuldt should take up the matter with the Appropriation Committees of the House and the Senate with a view to securing the necessary funds for the building-plans and for the new building.

H. A. Cammerer

Secretary

December 9, 1926.

Sir:

The act of Congress approved July 3, 1926, authorized a new building for the Police Court of the District of Columbia, to be erected on a site to be approved "by the Fine Arts Commission and by the chief justices of said police courts and Supreme Court of the District of Columbia".

At a meeting held December 7, 1926, the location for the Police Court building was fixed in Judiciary Square, at the southeast corner thereof, near the intersection of Fourth and E Streets, Northwest.

Respectfully,

Commission of Fine Arts.

Attest:

By Charles Moore.
Chairman.

Similar letter also to:
The Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations,
Chairman, House District Committee
Chairman, Senate District Committee,
The Director of the Budget,
The Commissioners of the
District of Columbia.

Gus A. Schuldt
Presiding Judge, Police Court, D.C.

Walter I. McCoy
Chief Justice, Supreme Court, D. C.

Hon. Charles G. Dawes,
Vice President of the United States,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

(Exhibit I)

COPY

December 27, 1926.

Dear Colonel Grant:

Your letter of December 1st, with reference to the Arlington Memorial Bridge, received careful consideration by the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on December 2, 1926.

The rapid increase in the number of interments at Arlington and the prospect that in the immediate future the National Cemetery must be enlarged, has led the Secretary of War, in consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts, to make plans for taking in the area formerly included in the Arlington Estate and now occupied by the Experimental Farms of the Agricultural Department. This area was allotted to the Agricultural Department by an Act of Congress, but the obvious necessity of the enlargement of the cemetery and the manifest inadequacy of the lands for the expanding needs of the Agricultural Department, have led to the uniformal acquiescence of all concerned in this enlargement of the cemetery.

The plan as prepared in the Office of the Secretary of War and approved by him brings the lands of the cemetery substantially down to the Potomac River. This will necessitate a restudy of the terminals of the Memorial Bridge on the Virginia side of the river. Obviously the time has come when that restudy should begin, and the Commission of Fine Arts recommend that the architects of the memorial bridge be asked to make such a restudy of the Virginia terminals as shall adapt them to the proposed new conditions. In this connection the beginnings of both the Lee Highway and the Mount Vernon Boulevard should be included.

Also, the Act providing for the Memorial Bridge involves the treatment of B Street North from the Capitol Grounds to the Potomac River. The discussions in the Public Buildings Commission indicate that it is the purpose of that Commission to carry out the intention of Congress, as expressed in the Memorial Bridge Act, by creating a thoroughfare of the very highest class throughout the entire course of B Street from the Capitol to the Potomac. Here is the one opportunity to treat both sides of an avenue with public buildings, an opportunity which even the treatment of Pennsylvania Avenue does not afford. Obviously such extension of B Street requires a suitable terminus at the Potomac, a terminus recognizing the beginning of the avenue (B Street) at the Capitol itself.

The sketch plans for the Memorial Bridge, as prepared in 1901 and as shown on the plans reported to Congress by the Memorial Bridge Commission, require a treatment of the waterfront from the Memorial Bridge to the westerly end of B Street. While the general plans have been made for such a treatment and the project has been virtually adopted, detailed studies have not been made. The Commission of Fine Arts, therefore, suggests that the architects of the Memorial Bridge be directed to make detailed plans for this treatment of the Potomac River between the Memorial Bridge and the westerly end of B Street, in accordance with the plan already outlined. Obviously these plans should be made by the same architects who have designed the Memorial Bridge, because they are essential portions of this structure. A print of the "Greater Arlington Plan" is enclosed. For the Commission;

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission.

EXHIBIT J.